

Eric

Helie

William

Hilton

Mike Ricketts

> David Swift

4:45 PM

5:15 PM

5:45 PM

6:00 PM

## **CITY OF REDMOND**Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen, Redmond OR 97756 541-923-7756 Fax: (541) 548-0706

www.ci.redmond.or.us

#### BPAC Agenda Monday, November 24, 2014 Conference Room A/B 4:00-6:00pm PM

### **Agenda**

BPAC Sub Committee Reports, Scenic Bikeway Discussion, Safe Routes to

Scenic Bikeway - Discussion on Promotion & Maps

Work with Schools - Identifying and Improving Safe Routes to

School (Work Plan Strategy: Infrastructure Improvements; Action: Develop a bike and pedestrian infrastructure map identifying routes and types of infrastructure to deploy)

MEMBERS	MEET OBJECT	School and Trail Surfacing	
David		TIME	ITEM
Alward			
Fred Bray		4:00 PM	COMMENCE MEETING
Sharon			DISCUSSION ITEMS:
Carrell		4:05 PM	BPAC Sub Committee Reports:
Bill			a. Media Campaign (Work Plan Strategy: Brand the System;
Braly			Action: Develop Information Campaign with a website and bicycle map)
Shirlee			b. Bike and Ped Infrastructure (Work Plan Strategy:
Evans			Infrastructure Improvements; Action: Develop a bike and
Bill			pedestrian infrastructure map identifying routes and types
Groesz	_		of infrastructure to deploy)
Katie Hammer	O AGENDA		c. Trails Amenities Plan (Work Plan Strategy: Infrastructure Improvements; Action: Develop an infrastructure standards methodology-type of infrastructure and when to deploy it)

Trail Surfacing Proposal

**ADJOURN** 



716 SW Evergreen Avenue Redmond, OR 97756 (541) 923-7721 Fax: (541) 548-0706 www.ci.redmond.or.us

## **EXHIBIT 1**

DATE: November 24, 2014

**TO:** Redmond Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

FROM: Scott Woodford, Associate Planner

**SUBJECT:** Trails Amenities Plan

#### **Report in Brief:**

This report summarizes the status of the draft Trails Amenities Plan.

#### **Background:**

The Trails Amenities Plan is a document of standards for amenities that typically are installed along trails. In Redmond this would apply to the proposed Homestead Trail and other future trails that are constructed within the Central Oregon Irrigation District (COID) easement. COID has agreed to allow trails in their easement on the condition that the types of trail amenities are specified in an adopted plan that they approve. The consultant for the Plan - Harper, Houf, Peterson Righellis, Inc. out of Bend - has made several presentations to the BPAC on the substance of the Plan. The BPAC then decided to establish a BPAC subcommittee to review the plan in more detail. The subcommittee (made up of Shirlee Evans, Bill Braly, William Hilton and staff) has since met several times to discuss the draft Plan and have made their recommendations, which now need to be reviewed and acknowledged by the entire BPAC. The consultant will take that direction and create a final draft of the document.

#### Discussion:

The summary of the BPAC subcommittee comments are attached (Attachment A). Please review them and be prepared to offer any comments at the meeting. It is staff's intention to leave the meeting with a BPAC recommendation and direction on the Plan.



716 SW Evergreen Avenue Redmond, OR 97756 (541) 923-7721 Fax: (541) 548-0706 www.ci.redmond.or.us

# BPAC Trail Amenities Plan Subcommittee Meeting Summary October 15 & November 19, 2014

## **Meeting Summary**

Subcommittee: Shirlee Evans, Bill Braly, William Hilton, Mike Caccavano, Heather Richards, and Scott Woodford

- 1. Trail Components issue: too many terms describing essentially the same thing; solution: strike the terms "staging area" and "gateway" and use trailhead (primary, secondary, tertiary); keep "rest area" and "trail nodes" as they are different things
- 2. Trail Types the group decided there are two basic types of trails and, for a lack of a better term, they are off-road and on-road trails (maybe we could call off-road trails just "trails" and on-road trails "paths"? Let's hear your suggestions!); each have a different primary function and should have a different level of amenity package associated with them
  - a. Off-road these are trails are typically constructed in a utility corridor (canal, utility line, etc.), are more recreational based than utilitarian based
  - b. On-road trails that are located within street right of ways (but physically separated from the street) and are used more for work and school commuting, shopping, going to the park, etc. versus being recreational (although they can be used for this too)
- 3. Amenity Themes agreed that outside of the Dry Canyon the amenities will be standardized and not reflect the theme of the particular trail corridor (for ease of maintenance, system identification, etc.)
- 4. Trail Amenity #1 Trail Construction Standards remove this section entirely as a trail is not an amenity and the standard should be in the Bike and Ped Infrastructure Plan and TSP; we discussed having several different widths based on the context, but that we would take that up later; Mike C. will redo the City trail standard section based on a 12' wide hard surface path and two 2' wide soft surface trails on each side
- 5. Trail Amenity #2, Wayfinding Signage decided this is very important and the content of the signs should include wayfinding and distance to major destination points; the group likes the new, red City wayfinding signage design as the standard for all areas except Dry Canyon with its own standard; group okay with low, wood distance markers in half mile

increments starting where emergency services wants them to start, only to be located on off road trails; several were concerned about the size of the signs and needing to be readable to bikers going by at a reasonable speed and also need minimum standards for the height of the signs (Mike C to look into typical standards); in term of location, wayfinding signs should be placed at all trail junctures and at important junctures adjacent to the trail (e.g. on streets parallel to the Dry Canyon Trail trailheads directing people to the trail); on the on-street infrastructure (or paths) wayfinding signs should be placed wherever there is a change in the direction of the path and ahead of major intersections.

- 6. Trail Amenity #2 Signage Kiosks: group was okay with the philosophy of locating the kiosks (more formal ones at the trailheads and smaller, less formal kiosks located in rural parts of the trail) and was okay with the different alternative designs shown in the Plan (with the exception of Alternative 4).
- 7. Trail Amenity #3 Seating, Benches and Staging Areas: group recommended changing the title of this to "trailheads" and "rest areas" (getting rid of the term staging areas) and adding a separate amenity of "benches and seating areas" that includes their design parameters and locations (group prefers the steel benches due to look and ease of maintenance). Group decided that trailheads and rest areas have different levels of amenity packages as follows:
  - Trailheads: Amenities may include auto parking, drinking water, shade (trees and/or structures), signage, benches, trash and recycling, kiosks bike racks, and restrooms
  - b. Rest Areas: Amenities may include benches, shade, kiosks, water (if available)
- 8. Trail Amenity #4 Area and Trail Lighting: group felt that lighting was only necessary at important intersections or dangerous sections of trails, as opposed to all along commuter trails, as most people who bike use a bike light for safety; in terms of lighting design, group liked metal path light in the Plan (black bollard light), but would defer to what is the best practice for lighting for trails in the areas noted above. Group felt that additional trail lighting may be necessary in the future when ridership reaches more critical mass, but that timing may not be right currently.
- 9. Trail Amenity #5 Restrooms: group was okay with the guidelines for location of restrooms recommended in the draft Trail Amenities Plan (i.e. restroom facilities should be located at primary trailheads and should be given consideration along other parts of the trail where water and sewer is available), but recommended they not be located within the COID easement (can be located adjacent though); group did not specify a specific restroom design although they did want to see any structure blend into the background as much as possible and had a concern about the screening of port a potties as potentially creating unsafe areas and locations for vandalism.
- 10. Trail Amenity #6 Trash and Recycling Stations: group supports location guidelines in Plan (at trailheads, rest areas, and along the trail where the City sees a user need) and supports using the existing black trash cans used elsewhere; group did support adding

- recycling facilities, but with the realization that it would be a new City service and may require additional staff resources to accomplish
- 11. Trail Amenity #7 Drinking Fountains: group supported them being located at trailheads and along trails where water lines are available and wanted the ability to fill up water bottles and provide drinking for dogs incorporated; did not specify specific design preference.
- 12. Trail Amenity #8 Bike Racks and Miscellaneous Furniture: supported proposed locations for bike racks (trailheads and rest areas) and were supportive of creativity in bike racks (as long as they are first and foremost, functional) and felt there wasn't a need for bike parking in Redmond, especially at trailheads (where the Plan recommends them).
- 13. Trail Amenity #9 Landscaping: group supported use of native and low maintenance trees and shrubs at trailheads and rest areas
- 14. Trail Amenity #10 Public Art and Interpretive Exhibits: group felt that public art should be encouraged in high use areas and at trailheads
- 15. General Comment: group felt that the blanket guideline placed into each amenity category about the need to retain flexibility in design and location to allow for new opportunities or unforeseen circumstances was important and should be an overarching statement in the intro section of the Plan, but didn't need to be repeated in each section.
- 16. General Comment #2: group wants cost estimates for various amenities to account for the cost of installation, in addition to the cost of the materials
- 17. General Comment #3: group wanted to ensure that we don't clutter landscapes with too many signs and to place information as paint on the trail where feasible to avoid clutter